

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/492,437	01/27/2000	Hatim Yousef Amro	AT9-99-483	9872
39698	7590 01/21/2005		EXAMINER	
DUKE W. Y	EE	NGUYEN, PHUOC H		
YEE & ASSO P.O. BOX 802	•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DALLAS, TX			2143	

DATE MAILED: 01/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/492,437	AMRO ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
•	Phuoc H. Nguyen	2143				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 26 December 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
	PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706,07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE:						
	B.⊠ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 112 1 st rejections for claims 1-29.					
	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment					
The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See below.						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly					
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	·					
Claim(s) allowed: None.						
Claim(s) objected to: None.						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-29</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <i>None</i> .						
· ,	The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.					
. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:	$-$ 0/ $($ \sim $)$					
BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT PRIMARY EXAMINER						

; i.

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

The applicant argues in pages 11-12 for claims 1,11,15, and 19 respectively that Budin et al. (Hereafter, Budin) U.S. Patent 5,276,703 does not disclose, teach or suggest the hub, wherein the hub is not connected to any external network. The examiner respectfully submits that with respect to figure 1 of Budin invention discloses a Hub Unit (HU) 12 and a plurality of Subscriber Units (SUs) 14a-14g are wirelessly communicates and wherein the Hub is not connected to any external network. Budin further discloses in figure 3 an alternative embodiment of the invention wherein a Hub 30 acts as the central controller for a plurality of networks 32,34,36, and 38, both hardwired and wireless. Budin's figure 3 shows that the hub and plurality of networks are communicate in a single network which is not connected to an external network.

In page 14, the applicant argues for claim 7 that the cited reference does not disclose or teach where at least one of the plurality of computing devices is portable. To further clarify the cited reference by Budin, the examiner respectfully submits Figure 2 of the cited reference by Buden further discloses a data terminal 22 may be a programmed digital computer or computer-related device, wherein the notebook/laptop computers, hand-held computers, palmtops, and PDAs are well known and wisely used in the art through it is inherently the computing devices could be the notebook/laptop computers, hand-held computers, palmtops, and PDAs, etc.

In page 15, the applicant argues for claim 9 that the cited reference does not disclose or teache wherein transmissions between each of the plurality of computing devices and the hub are infrared transmission. The examiner respectfully submits that the infrared transmission is the invisible radiation wavelength which can be translated as wireless transmission, which is disclose in Budin's reference.